

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the thorough examination of the above-referenced patent application and the reconsideration/withdrawal of the prior rejections. The Office Action, however, has continued to reject all examined claims 12, 13, and 22 on new grounds. Specifically, the Office Action has now rejected independent claim 12 as allegedly anticipated by Yoon (US 7,098,594). For at least the reasons set forth hereinbelow, Applicant respectfully request reconsideration of these rejections.

In response, Applicant has amended claim 12 to more clearly identify a novel and non-obvious feature of the claimed embodiments. In this regard, claim 12 has been added the limitation "...**a front substrate having a bus electrode and a first pattern comprising at least one line segment isolated from the bus electrode, the at least one line segment installed on the predetermined assembling position thereof...**".

This amendment renders the rejection moot. Notwithstanding, Applicant sets forth the following additional remarks in an effort to advance the prosecution of these claims.

As an initial matter, Applicant notes that the amended claim does not add any new matter to this application, as the newly added feature is clearly supported by the original application (see e.g., page 5, lines 5~21 and in FIG. 2A of the original application).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

As noted above, the Office Action rejected independent claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by Yoon et al. (US 7,098,594). To the extent the grounds of the rejection may be applied to claims now pending in this application, the rejections are respectively traversed.

As an initial matter, Applicant respectfully submits that it is unclear from the Office Action which elements of the plasma display panel (PDP) described by *Yoon* are considered to correspond to Applicant's "first pattern" and "second pattern" (the Office Action merely states "For Example: See Figure 1). For example, it is noted that Office Action appears to consider that Fig.1 of *Yoon* shows a discharge sustain electrode 32 for the first pattern of a front substrate 22. Thus, as best understood by Applicant, the Office Action alleges that **a bus electrode 32a and a transparent electrode section 32b of a discharge sustain electrode 32** of *Yoon* corresponds to Applicant's **the bus electrode and the first pattern of a front substrate, respectively**.

In this regard, Applicant respectfully asserts that the term "discharge sustain electrodes 32" of *Yoon* has been used in accordance with its common and ordinary meaning. Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that attributing *Yoon*'s discharge sustain electrodes 32 to Applicant's alignment mark is improper.

With respect to *Yoon*, *Yoon* discloses a plasma display panel. A first substrate (or rear substrate) 20 and a second substrate (or front substrate) 22 are provided at a predetermined distance from the first substrate 20 and form a vacuum assembly with the first substrate 20. Barrier ribs 26 form pixels between the first substrate 20 and the second substrate 22 such that subpixels 24 forming one grouping of pixels are arranged in a triangular configuration. A plurality of address electrodes 30 is formed on a surface of the first substrate 20 facing the second substrate 22 and along a first direction of the first substrate 20. A plurality of discharge-sustain electrodes 32 is formed on a surface of the second substrate 22 facing the first substrate 20 and along a first direction of the

second substrate 22. A phosphor layer and a discharge gas are provided between the first substrate 20 and the second substrate 22.

It is noted that the discharge sustain electrode 32 including a bus electrodes 32a and a transparent electrode section 32b connecting thereto (see Fig. 1) serves as a discharge electrode, but not as an alignment mark for reducing alignment errors or improving alignment accuracy. Moreover, the transparent electrode section 32b is formed extending from the bus electrode 32a to be positioned within areas corresponding to the subpixels.(column 2, lines 55 ~ lines 59).That is, the discharge sustain electrode 32 is simply a discharge electrode and thus the transparent electrode section 32b cannot be isolated from the bus electrode 32a or the discharge function is failed. In contrast to the bus electrode 32a and the transparent electrode section 32b of *Yoon*, the bus electrode and the first pattern of the claimed embodiments are used in pairs for alignment with the second pattern on a rear substrate, and the first pattern comprises at least one line segment isolated from the bus electrode. Accordingly, the bus electrode 32a of *Yoon* is connected to the transparent electrode section 32b as a part of discharge cell, but the bus electrode of claimed embodiments is isolated from the first pattern as a part of alignment mark. Consequently, Applicant respectfully submits that equating *Yoon*'s discharge sustain electrodes 32 to Applicant's alignment mark is inappropriate.

Turning now to the claims, amended claim 12 (as amended herein) specifically recites:

12. A plasma display panel (PDP), comprising:
a front substrate having **a bus electrode and a first pattern comprising at least one line segment isolated from the bus electrode,**
the at least one line segment installed on the predetermined assembling position thereof; and a rear substrate having a second pattern comprising at least one hexagonal honeycomb pattern formed with rib barriers

installed on the predetermined assembling position thereof, wherein the projection of the line segment is substantially parallel to at least one side of the hexagonal honeycomb pattern with a predetermined distance therebetween.

(*Emphasis Added*) Independent claim 12 patently defines over the cited art for at least the reason that the cited art fails to disclose the features emphasized above.

Applicant respectfully asserts that *Yoon* is legally deficient for the purpose of anticipating claim 12. Specifically, Applicant respectfully asserts that *Yoon* does not teach or otherwise disclose the features emphasized above in claim 12. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 12 is in condition for allowance. Since claim 13 is a dependent claim that depends from claim 12, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 13 is in condition for allowance.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Office Action rejected claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as allegedly unpatentable over *Yoon* in view of *Boo* (Korean Publication No. 2002019353). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections. Specifically, claim 22 patently defines over the combination at least by virtue of its dependency from claim 12.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that the cited references fail to disclose all the limitations of claim 12. Therefore, claim 12 is allowable over the cited references. Insofar as claims 13 and 22 depend from claim 12, these claims are also allowable.

Although claims 14-21 have tentatively been withdrawn from consideration, with the allowance of claim 12, the Examiner should consider and allow claims 14-21.

A credit card authorization is provided herewith to cover the additional fee that is associated with the accompanying RCE application. No additional fee is believed to be due in connection with this submission. If, however, any fee is deemed to be payable, you are hereby authorized to charge any such fee to Deposit Account No. 20-0778.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Daniel R. McClure/
Daniel R. McClure
Reg. No. 38,962

THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.
100 Galleria Parkway
Suite 1750
Atlanta, Georgia 30339-5948
(770) 933-9500